



355 W. North Temple • 3 Triad Center • Suite 350 • Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203 • 801-538-5340

September 9, 1985

see second

TO:

File

FROM:

Randy Harden

RE:

Sohio Shale Oil Company, DOE/047/018, and ACT/047/013

Uintah County, Utah

On August 13, 1985, Sue Linner, Dave Darby, Rick Summers, Dave Cline, Jim Leatherwood, and Randy Harden visited the site.

The purpose of the site visit was to determine to what extent reclamation had occured on the site and what remaining concerns or problems would have to be addressed as part of the reclamation.

The site covers approximately 20 acres and has been regraded and recontoured. The site has not yet been revegetated.

The major area of concern regarding the site is hydrology. Two of the three impoundments on the site are constructed in tar sands. The collection of water in these ponds appears to adversely affect the quality of the water passing through then by allowing the water to accumulate the tars of the formation. These two ponds are in the lower portion of the disturbed area. The areas immediately adjacent to the pond was not regraded and the ponds are still capable of impounding water.

The upper impoundment is located at the base of the area where the majority of the disturbance was reclaimed and forms a shallow basin and has no adverse impact to water quality on the site. This impoundment is adequate as is.

Much of the grading has heavily compacted the area and will require scarifying prior to revegetation.

It is recommended that the operator review the disposition of the site with the Division in order to determine what additional work will be performed on the site and what the timing is for such additional work, including revegetation.

Page 2 ACT/047/004 September 9, 1985

As to the bond amount of \$10,000, no part of the amount should be released until all the site is totally regraded and re-seeded, all exploration drill holes are accounted for and have been plugged. Upon completion of this work, partial bond release could occur but total release could not occur until at least three growing seasons have passed and the site has met the minimum standards for revegetation.

Problems as to the location and extent of the disturbed area under bond is due to not having a detailed plan map showing the disturbed area boundaries. Disturbance from the DOE also filed by SOHIO also complicates the process. If possible, SOHIO should submit a map clearly depicting where the permit area and the disturbed area boundaries are for the ACT permit and should also provide on the same map or as appropriate, a map for the DOE site.

It is recommended that SOHIO be encouraged to reclaim all the areas disturbed under their interest including the DOE site so that the area is returned to its original condition. Additional earth work at the existing reclamation site will need to be done in conjunction with re-seeding and revegetation work. It would be appropriate to reclaim the DOE, if possible, during those same activities.

cc: S. Linner 1010R-13



